

FUNDAMENTAL SOLUTION OF KINETIC FOKKER-PLANCK OPERATOR WITH ANISOTROPIC NONLOCAL DISSIPATIVITY

XICHENG ZHANG

ABSTRACT. By using the probability approach (the Malliavin calculus), we prove the existence of smooth fundamental solutions for degenerate kinetic Fokker-Planck equation with anisotropic nonlocal dissipativity, where the dissipative term is the generator of an anisotropic Lévy process and the drift term is allowed to be cubic growth.

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULT

Consider the following second order stochastic differential equation (SDE) in $\mathbb{R}^d$:

$$\frac{d^2 X_t}{dt^2} = -\nabla V(X_t) + \frac{dW_t}{dt} - \frac{dX_t}{dt}, \quad X_0 = x, \quad (1.1)$$

where $V(x) : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is a smooth function, and $(W_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a d -dimensional standard Brownian motion. In phase space $\mathbb{R}_x^d \times \mathbb{R}_v^d$, the position and velocity vector field $(X_t, \dot{X}_t)$ solves the following degenerate SDE:

$$\begin{cases} dX_t = \dot{X}_t dt, & X_0 = x, \\ d\dot{X}_t = -\nabla V(X_t) dt - \dot{X}_t dt + dW_t, & \dot{X}_0 = v. \end{cases} \quad (1.2)$$

The celebrated Hörmander's hypoellipticity theorem tells us that $(X_t, \dot{X}_t)$ admits a smooth density $\rho_{x,v}(t, x', v')$ (cf. [11, 16, 19, 18, 20]). Moreover, by Itô's formula, one knows that $\rho_{t,v}(t, x', v')$ solves the following kinetic Fokker-Planck equation:

$$\partial_t \rho - v' \cdot \nabla_{x'} \rho + \nabla V \cdot \nabla_{v'} \rho = \Delta_{v'} \rho - \operatorname{div}(v' \rho).$$

It is easy to check that the equilibrium of this equation is given by

$$\rho_\infty(x, v) := \exp\{-H(x, v)\}, \quad \text{where} \quad H(x, v) := \frac{|v|^2}{2} + V(x).$$

The rate of convergence to the equilibrium for the kinetic Fokker-Planck equation has been deeply studied in [8, 10, 27, 9], etc. Moreover, the stochastic flow property of SDE (1.2) was proven in [1, 30].

In this work, we shall consider equation (1.1) with Brownian motion $(W_t)_{t \geq 0}$ replaced by a Lévy process $(L_t)_{t \geq 0}$ (for example, the cylindrical α -stable process). More generally, we consider the following stochastic Hamiltonian system driven by Lévy process:

$$\begin{cases} dX_t = b_1(X_t, \dot{X}_t) dt, & X_0 = x, \\ d\dot{X}_t = b_2(X_t, \dot{X}_t) dt + dL_t, & \dot{X}_0 = v, \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

where $b = (b_1, b_2)$ is a smooth vector field on phase space $\mathbb{R}_x^d \times \mathbb{R}_v^d$. The background about stochastic Hamiltonian system and related Fokker-Planck equation is referred to [25]. From the microscopic viewpoint, stochastic equation (1.3) can be considered that the motion of particles is perturbed by a “discontinuous” stochastic force. We want to study the regularizing effect of Lévy noise to the system. It is well known that there are a lot of works devoting to the study of smooth densities for SDEs with jumps (see [6, 5, 21, 26, 12, 7, 14, 3], etc.). Nevertheless,

most of these works required that the jump noise is *non-degenerate*, and the main arguments are based upon developing an analogue of the Malliavin calculus for jump diffusions.

The main goal of the present paper is to prove that under some assumptions on b and L_t , the solution $(X_t, \dot{X}_t)$ of SDE (1.3) still has a smooth density. When b has bounded derivatives of all orders, $(\nabla_v b_1)(\nabla_v b_1)^*$ is uniform positive with respect to (x, v) , and L_t is an isotropic α -stable process, the smoothness of ρ was proved in [32]. However, in real model such as stochastic oscillators, the nonlinear term b is usually non-Lipschitz, and the Lévy noise may be *anisotropic* as that each component of L_t is independent.

Below, we first describe the noise L_t following [14]. Let $(L_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a d -dimensional Lévy process with the following form (called subordinated Brownian motion):

$$L_t := W_{S_t} = (W_{S_t}^1, \dots, W_{S_t}^d),$$

where $S_t = (S_t^1, \dots, S_t^d)$ is an independent d -dimensional $\mathbb{R}_+^d$ -valued Lévy process with characteristic triple $(\vartheta, 0, \nu_S)$, more precisely, its Laplace transform is given by

$$\mathbb{E}(e^{-z \cdot S_t}) = \exp \left\{ -t \vartheta \cdot z + \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} (e^{-z \cdot u} - 1) \nu_S(du) \right\}, \quad (1.4)$$

where $\vartheta \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$ and the Lévy measure ν_S satisfies

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} (1 \wedge |u|) \nu_S(du) < \infty.$$

In particular, each component S_t^i is a subordinator (cf. [4, 24]). By easy calculations, one can see that the characteristic function of L_t is given by

$$\mathbb{E} e^{iz \cdot L_t} = \exp \left\{ -t \sum_k \vartheta_k |z_k|^2 + t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (e^{iz \cdot y} - 1 - iz \cdot y 1_{|y| \leq 1}) \nu_L(dy) \right\}, \quad (1.5)$$

where ν_L is the Lévy measure given by

$$\nu_L(\Gamma) = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} \left(\int_{\Gamma} \frac{(2\pi)^{-d/2}}{(u_1 \cdots u_d)^{\frac{1}{2}}} e^{-\left(\frac{y_1^2}{2u_1} + \cdots + \frac{y_d^2}{2u_d}\right)} dy_1 \cdots dy_d \right) \nu_S(du_1, \dots, du_d). \quad (1.6)$$

Here we use the convention that if $u_i = 0$ for some i , then the inner integral is calculated with respect to the degenerate Gaussian distribution. In particular, ν_L may not be absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Obviously, ν_L is a symmetric measure.

Now we state the main assumptions on (ϑ, ν_S) and b :

(H _{ν_S} ¹) Let $\phi : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be defined by

$$\phi(\varepsilon) := \min_{i=1, \dots, d} \left(\vartheta_i + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{|u| \leq \varepsilon} u_i \nu_S(du) \right). \quad (1.7)$$

We assume that for some $\theta \in (0, 1]$,

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \varepsilon^{\theta-1} \phi(\varepsilon) > 0. \quad (1.8)$$

(H _{ν_S} ²) We assume that for any $p > 0$,

$$\int_{|u| > 1} e^{p|u|} \nu_S(du) < \infty, \quad (1.9)$$

which, by [24, p.159, Theorem 25.3], is equivalent to

$$\mathbb{E} e^{p S_t} < \infty. \quad (1.10)$$

(H_b) Assume that there exists a Lyapunov function $H : \mathbb{R}_x^d \times \mathbb{R}_v^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ with

$$|\nabla_v H|^2 \leq C_1 H, \quad |\nabla_v^2 H| \leq C_2, \quad (1.11)$$

and such that for any $m \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$ and some $q_m \geq 0$,

$$b \cdot \nabla H \leq C_3 H, \quad |\nabla^m b| \leq C_m (H^{q_m} + 1), \quad (1.12)$$

where $q_1 \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$. Moreover,

$$|\nabla_v b| + |\nabla_v^2 b| + |\nabla_v^3 b| \leq C_4, \quad (1.13)$$

and for any row vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$|u \nabla_v b_1(x, v)|^2 \geq C_5 |u|^2. \quad (1.14)$$

Remark 1.1. Let $(S_i^j)_{i=1, \dots, d}$ be independent α_i -stable subordinators, where $\alpha_i \in (0, 1)$. It is easy to check that (1.8) holds with $\theta = \min(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d)$.

Remark 1.2. In the case of equation (1.1), we can take

$$H(x, v) = \frac{1}{2} |v|^2 + V(x),$$

where $V \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}_+)$ satisfies that for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and some $q_m \geq 0$,

$$|\nabla^m V(x)| \leq C_m (V(x)^{q_m} + 1),$$

with $q_2 = \frac{1}{2}$. In particular, $V(x) = |x|^4$ satisfies this assumption. Since for any $p > 1$, compared with (1.10), it holds in general that (cf. [24, p.168, Theorem 26.1])

$$\mathbb{E} e^{S_t^p} = \infty,$$

we have to require $q_1 \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ in (1.12) (see Theorem 3.1 below).

The main result of this paper is:

Theorem 1.3. Under $(\mathbf{H}_{vs}^1)$, $(\mathbf{H}_{vs}^2)$ and $(\mathbf{H}_b)$, there exists a smooth density $\rho_{x,v}(t, x', v')$ to SDE (1.3) with bounded derivatives of all orders with respect to x', v' and such that

$$\partial_t \rho = \mathcal{L}_v \rho + \operatorname{div}_v(b\rho), \quad r > 0,$$

with $\rho_{x,v}(0, x', v') = \delta_{x,v}(x', v')$, where

$$\mathcal{L}_v f(v) = \text{P.V.} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (f(v+y) - f(v)) \nu_L(dy) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_k (\partial_k^2 f)(v) \vartheta_k,$$

where P.V. stands for the Cauchy principal value. Moreover, there exist constants $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3 > 0$ only depending on d, θ and a positive continuous function $(x, v) \mapsto C_{x,v}$ such that for all $(t, (x', v'), (x, v)) \in (0, 1] \times (\mathbb{R}_x^d \times \mathbb{R}_v^d)^2$,

$$\rho_{x,v}(t, x', v') \leq C_{x,v} \left(t^{-\beta_1} \left(1 \wedge \frac{t^{\beta_2}}{(|x - x'| + |v - v'|)^{\beta_3}} \right) \right). \quad (1.15)$$

Remark 1.4. If $b \in C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then the above $C_{x,v}$ can be constant. In this case, if one only requires the existence of smooth density, then assumption $(\mathbf{H}_{vs}^2)$ can be dropped by using the same argument as in [32, Section 3.3].

In order to prove this theorem, by taking regular conditional expectations with respect to $S_\cdot$, we shall regard the solution of SDE (1.3) as a Wiener functional, and then use the classical Malliavin calculus to prove Theorem 1.3. Such an idea was first used by L  ndre [17], and then in [14, 31]. We also mention that a derivative formula of Bismut type and the Harnack inequality for SDEs driven by α -stable processes were derived in [31] and [28] following the same idea. It is quite interesting to have an analytic proof of Theorem 1.3. It should be noticed that the L  vy measure ν_L could be very singular. This leads to that the symbol of operator $\mathcal{L}_\nu$

$$\Phi(\xi) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \left(1 - e^{i\langle \xi, y \rangle} - 1_{|y| \leq 1} \langle \xi, y \rangle\right) \nu_L(dy) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \partial_k^2 \xi_k^2$$

may not be C^1 -continuous differentiable on $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$. Thus, the classical pseudo-differential operator theory seems not applicable (cf. [11]). Below, we list some open questions for further studies:

- Can we prove the same result for multiplicative L  vy noise?
- Is it possible to remove the assumptions $q_1 \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ in (1.12) and $(\mathbf{H}_{\nu_S}^2)$?
- Is there a stationary distribution for stochastic Hamiltonian system (1.3)? If yes, how about the rate of convergence as $t \rightarrow \infty$?

This work is organized as follows: In Section 2, we prepare some notations and lemmas for later use. In particular, a Norris' type lemma is proven. In Section 3, we prove some exponential moment estimate about the SDE driven by W_{S_t} and with polynomial growth coefficients. In Section 4, we calculate the Malliavin covariance matrix for the solution of SDE as a Wiener functional. In Section 5, we prove the smoothness of distributional density of a degenerate SDE driven by W_{S_t} . Meanwhile, we conclude the proof of Theorem 1.3. Before concluding this introduction, we collect some notations or conventions for later use.

- Write $\mathbb{R}_+^d = [0, \infty)^d$ and $\mathbb{N}_0 = \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$.
- The inner product in Euclidean space is denoted by $\langle x, y \rangle$ or $x \cdot y$.
- For a vector $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$, we write $|x| := \left(\sum_i |x_i|^2\right)^{1/2} \sim \sum_i |x_i|$.
- $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$: The space of all smooth functions with compact support.
- $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$: The Schwarz space of rapidly decreasing smooth functions.
- $C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$: The space of all smooth bounded functions with bounded derivatives of all orders.
- $C_p^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$: The space of all smooth functions, which together with the derivatives of all orders are at most polynomial growth.
- The asterisk $*$ denotes the transpose of a matrix or a column vector, or the dual operator.
- ∇ denotes the gradient operator, and D the Malliavin derivative operator.
- C with or without index will denotes an unimportant positive constant.

2. PRELIMINARIES

We first introduce the canonical space of subordinated Brownian motion W_{S_t} . Let $(\mathbb{W}, \mathbb{H}, \mu_{\mathbb{W}})$ be the classical Wiener space, i.e., $\mathbb{W}$ is the space of all continuous functions from $\mathbb{R}_+$ to $\mathbb{R}^d$ with vanishing values at starting point 0, $\mathbb{H} \subset \mathbb{W}$ is the Cameron-Martin space consisting of all absolutely continuous functions with square integrable derivatives, $\mu_{\mathbb{W}}$ is the Wiener measure so that the coordinate process

$$W_t(w) := w_t$$

is a d -dimensional standard Brownian motion. Let $\mathbb{S}$ be the space of all c  dl  g functions from $\mathbb{R}_+$ to $\mathbb{R}_+^d$ with $\ell_0 = 0$, where each component is increasing. Suppose that $\mathbb{S}$ is endowed with the

Skorohod metric and the probability measure $\mu_{\mathbb{S}}$ so that the coordinate process

$$S_t(\ell) := \ell_t = (\ell_t^1, \dots, \ell_t^d)$$

is a d -dimensional Lévy process with Laplace transform (1.4). Consider the following product probability space

$$(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P) := (\mathbb{W} \times \mathbb{S}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{W}) \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{S}), \mu_{\mathbb{W}} \times \mu_{\mathbb{S}}),$$

and define for $(w, \ell) \in \mathbb{W} \times \mathbb{S}$,

$$L_t(w, \ell) := w_{\ell_t} := (w_1(\ell_1(t)), \dots, w_d(\ell_d(t))).$$

Then $(L_t)_{t \geq 0}$ is a Lévy process with characteristic function (1.5). We use the following filtration:

$$\mathcal{F}_t := \sigma\{W_{S_s}, S_s : s \leq t\}.$$

Clearly, for $t > s$, $W_{S_t} - W_{S_s}$ and $S_t - S_s$ are independent of $\mathcal{F}_s$.

2.1. An exponential estimate of S_t . The following estimate of exponential type about S_t will play an important role in the proof of Theorem 1.3.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $f_t : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+^d$ be a continuous $\mathcal{F}_t$ -adapted process. For any $R, \varepsilon, \delta > 0$, we have*

$$P \left\{ \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_R} f_s \cdot dS_s \leq \varepsilon; \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_R} |f_s| ds > \delta \right\} \leq e^{1 - \phi(\varepsilon/R)\delta/\varepsilon},$$

where $\tau_R := \inf\{t \geq 0 : |f_t| > R\}$ and ϕ is defined by (1.7).

Proof. For $\lambda > 0$, set

$$g_s^\lambda := \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} (1 - e^{-\lambda f_s \cdot u}) \nu_S(du)$$

and

$$M_t^\lambda := -\lambda \int_0^t f_s \cdot dS_s + \lambda \int_0^t f_s \cdot \vartheta ds + \int_0^t g_s^\lambda ds.$$

Let $\mu(t, du)$ be the Poisson random measure associated with S_t , i.e.,

$$\mu(t, \Gamma) := \sum_{s \leq t} 1_\Gamma(S_s - S_{s-}), \quad \Gamma \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+^d).$$

Let $\tilde{\mu}(t, du)$ be the compensated Poisson random measure of $\mu(t, du)$, i.e.,

$$\tilde{\mu}(t, du) = \mu(t, du) - t\nu_S(du).$$

Then, by Lévy-Itô's decomposition (cf. [24]), we can write

$$S_t = t \left(\vartheta + \int_{|u| \leq 1} u \nu_S(du) \right) + \int_{|u| \leq 1} u \tilde{\mu}(t, du) + \int_{|u| > 1} u \mu(t, du), \quad (2.1)$$

and so,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t f_s \cdot dS_s &= \int_0^t f_s \cdot \left(\vartheta + \int_{|u| \leq 1} u \nu_S(du) \right) ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_{|u| \leq 1} f_s \cdot u \tilde{\mu}(ds, du) + \int_0^t \int_{|u| > 1} f_s \cdot u \mu(ds, du). \end{aligned}$$

By Itô's formula (cf. [2]), we have

$$e^{M_t^\lambda} = 1 + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} e^{M_{s-}^\lambda} [e^{-\lambda f_s \cdot u} - 1] \tilde{\mu}(ds, du). \quad (2.2)$$

Since for any $x > 0$,

$$1 - e^{-x} \leq 1 \wedge x,$$

we have

$$g_s^\lambda \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} (1 \wedge (\lambda f_s \cdot u)) \nu_S(du)$$

and

$$M_{t \wedge \tau_R}^\lambda \leq \lambda \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_R} f_s \cdot \vartheta ds + \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_R} g_s^\lambda ds \leq tR|\vartheta| + t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} (1 \wedge (\lambda R|u|)) \nu_S(du).$$

Hence, by (2.2) we have

$$\mathbb{E} e^{M_{t \wedge \tau_R}^\lambda} = 1.$$

On the other hand, since for any $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ and $x \leq -\log k$,

$$1 - e^{-x} \geq \kappa x,$$

letting $\kappa = \frac{1}{e}$, we have for $s \leq \tau_R$,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda f_s \cdot \vartheta + g_s^\lambda &\geq \lambda f_s \cdot \vartheta + \int_{|u| \leq \frac{1}{\lambda R}} (1 - e^{-\lambda f_s \cdot u}) \nu_S(du) \\ &\geq \lambda f_s \cdot \vartheta + \frac{1}{e} \int_{|u| \leq \frac{1}{\lambda R}} (\lambda f_s \cdot u) \nu_S(du) \\ &= \lambda f_s \cdot \left(\vartheta + \frac{1}{e} \int_{|u| \leq \frac{1}{\lambda R}} u \nu_S(du) \right) \\ &\geq \lambda \phi(1/(\lambda R)) |f_s|, \end{aligned}$$

where ϕ is defined by (1.7). Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\{ \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_R} f_s \cdot dS_s \leq \varepsilon; \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_R} |f_s| ds > \delta \right\} \\ &\subset \left\{ e^{M_{t \wedge \tau_R}^\lambda} \geq e^{-\lambda \varepsilon + \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_R} (\lambda f_s \cdot \vartheta + g_s^\lambda) ds}; \int_0^{t \wedge \tau_R} (\lambda f_s \cdot \vartheta + g_s^\lambda) ds > \lambda \phi(1/(\lambda R)) \delta \right\} \\ &\subset \left\{ e^{M_{t \wedge \tau_R}^\lambda} \geq e^{-\lambda \varepsilon + \lambda \phi(1/(\lambda R)) \delta} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

which then implies the result by Chebyshev's inequality and letting $\lambda = \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$. $\square$

2.2. A Norris' type lemma. Let $N(t, dy)$ be the Poisson random measure associated with $L_t = W_{S_t}$, i.e.,

$$N(t, \Gamma) = \sum_{s \leq t} 1_\Gamma(L_s - L_{s-}), \quad \Gamma \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

Let $\tilde{N}(t, dy)$ be the compensated Poisson random measure of $N(t, dy)$, i.e.,

$$\tilde{N}(t, dy) = N(t, dy) - t\nu_L(dy),$$

where ν_L is the Lévy measure of L_t given by (1.6). By Lévy-Itô's decomposition, we have

$$L_t = W_{S_t} = W_{\theta t} + \int_{|u| \leq 1} y \tilde{N}(t, dy) + \int_{|u| > 1} y N(t, dy), \quad (2.3)$$

where we have used that for any $0 < r < R < \infty$,

$$\int_{r < |y| \leq R} y \nu_L(dy) = 0.$$

Notice that $(W_{\theta t})_{t \geq 0}$, $\left(\int_{|u| \leq 1} y \tilde{N}(t, dy) \right)_{t \geq 0}$ and $\left(\int_{|u| > 1} y N(t, dy) \right)_{t \geq 0}$ are independent.

Recall the following result about the exponential estimate of martingales (cf. [20, p.352, (A.5)] and [7, Lemma 1]).

Lemma 2.2. Let $\delta, R, \eta, T > 0$.

(i) Let M_t be a continuous square integrable martingale, then

$$P \left\{ \sup_{s \in [0, T]} |M_s| \geq \delta; \langle M \rangle_T < \eta \right\} \leq 2 \exp \left\{ -\frac{\delta^2}{2\eta} \right\}.$$

(ii) Let $f_t(y)$ be a bounded $\mathcal{F}_t$ -predictable process with bound R , then

$$P \left\{ \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_s(y) \tilde{N}(ds, dy) \right| \geq \delta, \int_0^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f_s(y)|^2 \nu_L(dy) ds < \eta \right\} \leq 2 \exp \left(-\frac{\delta^2}{2(R\delta + \eta)} \right).$$

The following lemma is contained in the proof of Norris' lemma (cf. [20, p.137] and [31]).

Lemma 2.3. For $T > 0$, let f be a bounded measurable $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued function on $[0, T]$. Assume that for some $\varepsilon < T$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\int_0^T \left| x + \int_0^t f_s ds \right|^2 dt \leq \varepsilon^3. \quad (2.4)$$

Then we have

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \int_0^t f_s ds \right| \leq 2(1 + \|f\|_\infty) \varepsilon.$$

We now prove the following Norris' type lemma (cf. [19, 20, 7, 31]).

Lemma 2.4. Let $Y_t = y + \int_0^t \beta_s ds$ be an $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued process, where β_t takes the following form:

$$\beta_t = \beta_0 + \int_0^t \gamma_s ds + \int_0^t Q_s dW_{\vartheta_s} + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_s(y) \tilde{N}(ds, dy),$$

where $\gamma_t : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, $Q_t : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ and $g_t(y) : \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ are three left continuous $\mathcal{F}_t$ -adapted processes. Suppose that for some left continuous $\mathcal{F}_t$ -adapted $\mathbb{R}_+$ -valued process α_t ,

$$|g_t(y)| \leq \alpha_t(1 \wedge |y|). \quad (2.5)$$

Then there exists a constant $C \geq 1$ such that for any $t \in (0, 1)$, $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{3})$, $\varepsilon \in (0, t^3)$ and $R \geq 1$,

$$P \left\{ \tau_R > t, \int_0^t |Y_s|^2 ds < \varepsilon, \int_0^t |\beta_s|^2 ds \geq 9R^2 \varepsilon^\delta \right\} \leq 4 \exp \left\{ -\frac{\varepsilon^{\delta - \frac{1}{3}}}{CR^4} \right\}, \quad (2.6)$$

where

$$\tau_R := \inf \{ t \geq 0 : |\beta_t| + |\gamma_t| + |Q_t| + \alpha_t > R \}.$$

Proof. Let us define

$$h_t := \int_0^t \beta_s ds, \quad M_t^c := \int_0^t \langle h_s, Q_s dW_{\vartheta_s} \rangle, \quad M_t^d := \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \langle h_s, g_s(y) \rangle \tilde{N}(ds, dy),$$

and

$$E_1 := \left\{ \int_0^t |Y_s|^2 ds < \varepsilon \right\}, \quad E_2 := \left\{ \sup_{s \in [0, t]} |h_s| \leq 4R\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{3}} \right\},$$

$$E_3 := \left\{ \langle M^c \rangle_t \leq C_0 R^4 \varepsilon^{\frac{2}{3}} \right\}, \quad E_4 := \left\{ \sup_{s \in [0, t]} |M_s^c| \leq \frac{\varepsilon^\delta}{2} \right\},$$

$$E_5 := \left\{ \langle M^d \rangle_t \leq C_1 R^4 \varepsilon^{\frac{2}{3}} \right\}, \quad E_6 := \left\{ \sup_{s \in [0, t]} |M_s^d| \leq \frac{\varepsilon^\delta}{2} \right\},$$

$$E_7 := \left\{ \int_0^t |\beta_s|^2 ds < 9R^2 \varepsilon^\delta \right\},$$

where C_0 and C_1 are two constants determined below.

First of all, by Lemma 2.3, one sees that for $\varepsilon < T^3$,

$$\{\tau_R > t\} \cap E_1 \subset \{\tau_R > t\} \cap E_2 \subset \{\tau_R > t\} \cap E_3 \cap E_5, \quad (2.7)$$

where the second inclusion is due to

$$\langle M^c \rangle_t = \int_0^t |\langle h_s, Q_s \vartheta \rangle|^2 ds \leq (4R)^2 R^2 |\vartheta|^2 \varepsilon^{\frac{2}{3}} =: C_0 R^4 \varepsilon^{\frac{2}{3}}$$

and

$$\langle M^d \rangle_t = \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\langle h_s, g_s(y) \rangle|^2 \nu_L(dy) ds \leq (4R)^2 R^2 \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} 1 \wedge |y|^2 \nu_L(dy) \right) \varepsilon^{\frac{2}{3}} =: C_1 R^4 \varepsilon^{\frac{2}{3}}.$$

On the other hand, by integration by parts formula, we have

$$\int_0^t |\beta_s|^2 ds = \int_0^t \langle \beta_s, dh_s \rangle = \langle \beta_t, h_t \rangle - \int_0^t \langle h_s, \gamma_s \rangle dt - M_t^c - M_t^d.$$

From this, one sees that on $\{\tau_R > t\} \cap E_2 \cap E_4$,

$$\int_0^t |\beta_s|^2 ds \leq 4R^2 \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}(1+t) + \varepsilon^\delta \leq (8R^2 + 1)\varepsilon^\delta \leq 9R^2 \varepsilon^\delta.$$

This means that

$$\{\tau_R > t\} \cap E_2 \cap E_4 \cap E_6 \subset \{\tau_R > t\} \cap E_7,$$

which together with (2.7) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \{\tau_R > t\} \cap E_1 \cap E_7^c &\subset \{\tau_R > t\} \cap E_1 \cap (E_4^c \cup E_6^c) \\ &\subset (\{\tau_R > t\} \cap E_3 \cap E_4^c) \cup (\{\tau_R > t\} \cap E_5 \cap E_2 \cap E_6^c). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Lemma 2.2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(\{\tau_R > t\} \cap E_1 \cap E_7^c) &\leq P(E_3 \cap E_4^c) + P(\{\tau_R > t\} \cap E_2 \cap E_5 \cap E_6^c) \\ &\leq 2 \exp \left\{ -\frac{\varepsilon^{2(\delta - \frac{1}{3})}}{8C_0 R^4} \right\} + 2 \exp \left(-\frac{\varepsilon^{2\delta}}{8(4R^2 \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{3} + \delta} + C_1 R^4 \varepsilon^{\frac{2}{3}})} \right) \\ &\leq 2 \exp \left\{ -\frac{\varepsilon^{\delta - \frac{1}{3}}}{8C_0 R^4} \right\} + 2 \exp \left\{ -\frac{\varepsilon^{\delta - \frac{1}{3}}}{8(4 + C_1)R^4} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and (2.6) follows by choosing $C := 8(C_0 \vee (4 + C_1))$. $\square$

2.3. Malliavin's calculus. In this subsection we recall some basic notions and facts about the Malliavin calculus (cf. [15, 18, 20]). Let $\mathbb{U}$ be a real separable Hilbert space. Let $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{U})$ be the class of all $\mathbb{U}$ -valued smooth cylindrical functionals on Ω with the form:

$$F = \sum_{i=1}^m f_i(W(h_1), \dots, W(h_n)) u_i,$$

where $f_i \in C_p^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $u_i \in \mathbb{U}$, $h_1, \dots, h_n \in \mathbb{H}$ and

$$W(h) = \int_0^\infty h_s dW_s.$$

The Malliavin derivative of F is defined by

$$DF := \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n (\partial_j f_i)(W(h_1), \dots, W(h_n)) u_i \otimes h_j \in \mathbb{U} \otimes \mathbb{H}.$$

By an iteration argument, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the higher order Malliavin derivative $D^k F$ of F can be defined as a random variable in $\mathbb{U} \otimes \mathbb{H}^{\otimes k}$. It is well known that the operator $(D^k, \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{U}))$ is closable from $L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{U})$ to $L^p(\Omega; \mathbb{U} \otimes \mathbb{H}^{\otimes k})$ for each $p \geq 1$ (cf. [20, p.26, Proposition 1.2.1]). For every $p \geq 1$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we introduce a norm on $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{U})$ by

$$\|F\|_{k,p} := \left(\mathbb{E}|F|^p + \sum_{l=1}^k \mathbb{E}(\|D^l F\|_{\mathbb{H}^{\otimes l}}^p) \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

The Wiener-Sobolev space $\mathbb{D}^{k,p}(\mathbb{U})$ is defined as the closure of $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{U})$ with respect to the above norm. Below we shall simply write

$$\mathbb{D}^\infty(\mathbb{U}) := \cap_{m \in \mathbb{N}, p \geq 1} \mathbb{D}^{m,p}(\mathbb{U})$$

and

$$\mathbb{D}^{k,p} := \mathbb{D}^{k,p}(\mathbb{R}^d), \quad \mathbb{D}^\infty := \mathbb{D}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d).$$

The dual operator D^* of D (also called divergence operator) is defined by

$$\mathbb{E}\langle DF, U \rangle_{\mathbb{H}} = \mathbb{E}(FD^*U), \quad U \in \text{Dom}(D^*) = \mathbb{D}^{1,2}(\mathbb{H}).$$

The following Meyer's inequality holds (cf. [20, p.75, Proposition 1.5.4]). For any $p > 1$ and $U \in \mathbb{D}^{1,p}(\mathbb{H})$,

$$\|D^*U\|_p \leq C_p \|U\|_{1,p}. \quad (2.8)$$

Let $F = (F^1, \dots, F^d)$ be a random vector in $\mathbb{D}^{1,2}$. The Malliavin covariance matrix of F is defined by

$$(\Sigma_F)_{ij} := \langle DF^i, DF^j \rangle_{\mathbb{H}}$$

The following theorem about the criterion that a random vector admits a smooth density in the Malliavin calculus can be found in [20, p.100-103].

Theorem 2.5. *Assume that $F = (F^1, \dots, F^d) \in \mathbb{D}^\infty$ is a smooth Wiener functional and satisfies that for all $p \geq 2$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[(\det \Sigma_F)^{-p}] < \infty.$$

Let $G \in \mathbb{D}^\infty$ and $\varphi \in C_p^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then for any multi-index $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}^m$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\partial_\alpha \varphi(F)G] = \mathbb{E}[\varphi(F)H_\alpha(F, G)],$$

where $\partial_\alpha = \partial_{\alpha_1} \cdots \partial_{\alpha_m}$, and $H_\alpha(F, G)$ are recursively defined by

$$H_{(i)}(F, G) := \sum_j D^* \left(G(\Sigma_F^{-1})_{ij} DF^j \right), \quad (2.9)$$

$$H_\alpha(F, G) := H_{(\alpha_m)}(F, H_{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m-1})}(F, G)).$$

As a consequence, for any $p \geq 1$, there exists $p_1, p_2, p_3 > 1$ and $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\|H_\alpha(F, G)\|_p \leq C \|(\det \Sigma_F)^{-1}\|_{p_1}^{n_1} \|DF\|_{m,p_2}^{n_2} \|G\|_{m,p_3}. \quad (2.10)$$

In particular, the law of F possesses an infinitely differentiable density $\rho \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

About the estimate of the density, we recall the following result from Kusuoka-Stroock [15, Theorem 1.28].

Theorem 2.6. *In the situation of Theorem 2.5, for any $q > d$, there exists a constant $C = C(q, d) > 0$ such that for any $\psi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$,*

$$\sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} |\psi(y)\rho(y)| \leq C \|\psi(F)\|_q^{1-\frac{d}{q}} \left(\sum_i \|H_{(i)}(F, 1)\|_q \right)^{d-\frac{d}{q}} \left(\sum_i \|H_{(i)}(F, \psi(F))\|_q \right)^{\frac{d}{q}}, \quad (2.11)$$

provided that the right hand side is finite.

3. EXPONENTIAL MOMENT ESTIMATE FOR SDEs DRIVEN BY W_{S_t}

In this section, we mainly prove some estimates about the exponential moments for the solutions of SDEs with non-Lipschitz coefficients. Consider the following SDE driven by W_{S_t} :

$$dX_t = b(X_t)dt + AdW_{S_t}, \quad X_0 = x, \quad (3.1)$$

where $b : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is a smooth function and $A = (a_{ij})$ is a constant $d \times d$ matrix.

Recall that a C^2 -function $H : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is called a Lyapunov function if

$$\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} H(x) = \infty. \quad (3.2)$$

We assume that for some Lyapunov function H and $\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3 \geq 0$,

$$b(x) \cdot \nabla H(x) \leq \kappa_1 H(x), \quad (3.3)$$

and for all $k = 1, \dots, d$,

$$\left| \sum_i \partial_i H(x) a_{ik} \right|^2 \leq \kappa_2 H(x), \quad (3.4)$$

$$\sum_{ij} \partial_i \partial_j H(x) a_{ik} a_{jk} \leq \kappa_3. \quad (3.5)$$

Moreover, we also assume the following local Lipschitz condition: for any $R > 0$ and all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $H(x), H(y) \leq R$,

$$|b(x) - b(y)| \leq C_R |x - y|. \quad (3.6)$$

It should be noticed that stochastic differential equation (3.1) can not be solved by using $Y_t = X_t - AW_{S_t}$ to transform (3.1) into an ordinary differential equation with *time-dependent* coefficients, since the above conditions are not invariant under this transform. Moreover, a direct application of Itô's formula seems not work because of the nonlocal feature of Lévy processes.

The main aim of this section is to prove the following estimate.

Theorem 3.1. *Assume (3.3)-(3.6). For any initial value $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, there exists a unique càdlàg $\mathcal{F}_t$ -adapted process $t \mapsto X_t$ solving equation (3.1), and for all $t \geq 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ \frac{2 \sup_{s \in [0, t]} H(X_s)}{e^{\kappa_1 t} (\kappa_2 |S_t| + 1)} \right\} \right] \leq C_{\kappa_2, \kappa_3} e^{H(x)}. \quad (3.7)$$

Moreover, if we also assume $(\mathbf{H}_{v_S}^2)$, then for any $p \geq 1$ and $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ p \sup_{s \in [0, t]} H(X_s)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} \right] \leq C_{\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3, p, t} e^{H(x)}. \quad (3.8)$$

Proof. First of all, by (3.6) it is standard to prove the existence and uniqueness of local solutions for equation (3.1). Our main aim is to prove the apriori estimate (3.7). We shall use the approximation argument as used in [31].

For fixed $\ell \in \mathbb{S}$, consider the following SDE driven by discontinuous martingale W_{ℓ_t} :

$$dX_t^\ell = b(X_t^\ell)dt + AdW_{\ell_t}, \quad X_0^\ell = x. \quad (3.9)$$

Clearly, it suffices to prove that there exists a unique càdlàg function $t \mapsto X_t^\ell$ solving equation (3.9), and for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ \frac{2 \sup_{s \in [0, t]} H(X_s^\ell)}{e^{\kappa_1 t} (\kappa_2 |\ell_t| + 1)} \right\} \right] \leq C_{\kappa_2, \kappa_3} e^{H(x)}. \quad (3.10)$$

Below, for the simplicity of notations, we drop the superscripts “ ℓ ”, and divide the proof into four steps.

(Step 1). Let us first consider the case that each component of ℓ is absolutely continuous and strictly increasing. By Itô’s formula, (3.3) and (3.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\kappa_1 t} H(X_t) &= H(x) + \int_0^t e^{-\kappa_1 s} (b \cdot \nabla H - \kappa_1 H)(X_s) ds + \int_0^t e^{-\kappa_1 s} \langle \nabla H(X_s), \text{Ad} W_{\ell_s} \rangle \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ijk} \int_0^t e^{-\kappa_1 s} \partial_i \partial_j H(X_s) a_{ik} a_{jk} d\ell_s^k \\ &\leq H(x) + \int_0^t e^{-\kappa_1 s} \langle \nabla H(X_s), \text{Ad} W_{\ell_s} \rangle + \frac{\kappa_3}{2} |\ell_t|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

For $R > 0$, define the stopping time

$$\tau_R := \inf\{t \geq 0 : |X_t| \geq R\}.$$

Taking expectations for both sides of (3.11), we obtain that for all $t > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left(e^{-\kappa_1(t \wedge \tau_R)} H(X_{t \wedge \tau_R})\right) \leq H(x) + \frac{\kappa_3}{2} |\ell_t|.$$

This implies by (3.2) that

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \tau_R = \infty. \quad (3.12)$$

(Step 2). Write for $\lambda > 0$,

$$M_t^\lambda := \lambda \int_0^t e^{-\kappa_1 s} \langle \nabla H(X_s), \text{Ad} W_{\ell_s} \rangle.$$

Then by (3.11), we have

$$\exp\{\lambda e^{-\kappa_1 t} H(X_t)\} \leq \exp\left\{\lambda H(x) + \frac{\lambda \kappa_3}{2} |\ell_t|\right\} \exp\{M_t^\lambda\}. \quad (3.13)$$

Notice that $t \mapsto M_t^\lambda$ is a continuous local martingale with covariance

$$\langle M^\lambda \rangle_t := \lambda^2 \sum_k \int_0^t \left| e^{-\kappa_1 s} \sum_i \partial_i H(X_s) a_{ik} \right|^2 d\ell_s^k \stackrel{(3.4)}{\leq} \lambda^2 \kappa_2 G_t |\ell_t|, \quad (3.14)$$

where

$$G_t := \sup_{s \in [0, t]} (e^{-\kappa_1 s} H(X_s)). \quad (3.15)$$

By Novikov’s criterion (cf. [23]), one knows that

$$t \mapsto \exp\left\{M_{t \wedge \tau_R}^\lambda - \frac{1}{2} \langle M^\lambda \rangle_{t \wedge \tau_R}\right\} \text{ is a continuous exponential martingale,}$$

and by Doob’s inequality about positive submartingales and Hölder’s inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \exp\left\{\sup_{s \in [0, t]} M_{s \wedge \tau_R}^\lambda\right\} &\leq 2 \left(\mathbb{E} \exp\{2M_{t \wedge \tau_R}^\lambda\}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq 2 \left(\mathbb{E} \exp\left\{M_{t \wedge \tau_R}^{4\lambda} - \frac{1}{2} \langle M^{4\lambda} \rangle_{t \wedge \tau_R}\right\}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\mathbb{E} \exp\{8 \langle M^\lambda \rangle_{t \wedge \tau_R}\}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \\ &= 2 \left(\mathbb{E} \exp\{8 \langle M^\lambda \rangle_{t \wedge \tau_R}\}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}}. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling (3.15) and by (3.13) and (3.14), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \exp\{\lambda G_{t \wedge \tau_R}\} \leq \exp\left\{\lambda H(x) + \frac{\lambda \kappa_3}{2} |\ell_t|\right\} \mathbb{E} \exp\left\{\sup_{s \in [0, t]} M_{s \wedge \tau_R}^\lambda\right\}$$

$$\leq 2 \exp \left\{ \lambda H(x) + \frac{\lambda \kappa_3}{2} |\ell_t| \right\} \left(\mathbb{E} \left\{ 8 \lambda^2 \kappa_2 G_{t \wedge \tau_R} |\ell_t| \right\} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}.$$

Thus, if one takes $\lambda = \frac{1}{8(\kappa_2|\ell_t|+1)}$, then

$$\mathbb{E} \exp \left\{ \frac{G_{t \wedge \tau_R}}{8(\kappa_2|\ell_t|+1)} \right\} \leq 2^{\frac{4}{3}} \exp \left\{ \frac{H(x)}{6(\kappa_2|\ell_t|+1)} + \frac{\kappa_3}{12\kappa_2} \right\} \leq C_{\kappa_2, \kappa_3} e^{H(x)}.$$

Finally, by Fatou's lemma and (3.12), letting $R \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$\mathbb{E} \exp \left\{ \frac{\sup_{s \in [0, t]} H(X_s)}{8e^{\kappa_1 t} (\kappa_2 |\ell_t| + 1)} \right\} \leq \mathbb{E} \exp \left\{ \frac{\sup_{s \in [0, t]} (e^{-\kappa_1 s} H(X_s))}{8(\kappa_2 |\ell_t| + 1)} \right\} \leq C_{\kappa_2, \kappa_3} e^{H(x)}. \quad (3.16)$$

(Step 3). For general $\ell \in \mathbb{S}$, let us define the Stelkov's average of ℓ by

$$\ell_t^n := n \int_t^{t+1/n} \ell_s ds + \frac{t}{n} = \int_0^1 \ell_{t+s/n} ds + \frac{t}{n}.$$

It is clear that $t \mapsto \ell_t^n$ is absolutely continuous and strictly increasing. Moreover, for each $t > 0$,

$$\ell_t^n \downarrow \ell_t. \quad (3.17)$$

By (3.16) one has the following uniform estimate:

$$\mathbb{E} \exp \left\{ \frac{\sup_{s \in [0, t]} H(X_s^{\ell^n})}{8e^{\kappa_1 t} (\kappa_2 |\ell_t^n| + 1)} \right\} \leq C_{\kappa_2, \kappa_3} e^{H(x)}. \quad (3.18)$$

If we define

$$\tau_{R_1}^n := \inf \{ t \geq 0 : H(X_t^{\ell^n}) \geq R_1 \}$$

and

$$\tau_{R_2} := \inf \{ t \geq 0 : H(X_t^\ell) \geq R_2 \},$$

then by (3.6) and equation (3.9), we have for $t < \tau_{R_1}^n \wedge \tau_{R_2}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |X_t^{\ell^n} - X_t^\ell| &\leq \int_0^t |b(X_s^{\ell^n}) - b(X_s^\ell)| ds + \|A\| \cdot |W_{\ell_t^n} - W_{\ell_t}| \\ &\leq C_{R_1 \vee R_2} \int_0^t |X_s^{\ell^n} - X_s^\ell| ds + \|A\| \cdot |W_{\ell_t^n} - W_{\ell_t}|, \end{aligned}$$

which yields by Gronwall's inequality that

$$|X_t^{\ell^n} - X_t^\ell| \leq \|A\| \cdot |W_{\ell_t^n} - W_{\ell_t}| + \exp \{ C_{R_1 \vee R_2} t \} \|A\| \int_0^t |W_{\ell_s^n} - W_{\ell_s}| ds.$$

Now, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, by Chebyshev's inequality and (3.18), we have

$$\begin{aligned} P \left\{ |X_t^{\ell^n} - X_t^\ell| > \varepsilon, t < \tau_{R_2} \right\} &\leq P \left\{ t \geq \tau_{R_1}^n \right\} + P \left\{ |X_t^{\ell^n} - X_t^\ell| > \varepsilon; t < \tau_{R_1}^n \wedge \tau_{R_2} \right\} \\ &\leq P \left\{ \sup_{s \in [0, t]} H(X_s^{\ell^n}) \geq R_1 \right\} + P \left\{ \|A\| \cdot |W_{\ell_t^n} - W_{\ell_t}| > \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right\} \\ &\quad + P \left\{ \exp \{ C_{R_1 \vee R_2} t \} \|A\| \int_0^t |W_{\ell_s^n} - W_{\ell_s}| ds > \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right\} \\ &\leq \frac{2}{R_1} \sup_n \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{s \in [0, t]} H(X_s^{\ell^n}) \right) + \frac{2\|A\|}{\varepsilon} \mathbb{E} |W_{\ell_t^n} - W_{\ell_t}| \\ &\quad + \frac{2 \exp \{ C_{R_1 \vee R_2} t \} \|A\|}{\varepsilon} \int_0^t \mathbb{E} |W_{\ell_s^n} - W_{\ell_s}| ds \\ &\leq \frac{C}{R_1} + \frac{2\|A\|}{\varepsilon} |\ell_t^n - \ell_t|^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{2 \exp \{ C_{R_1 \vee R_2} t \} \|A\|}{\varepsilon} \int_0^t |\ell_s^n - \ell_s|^{\frac{1}{2}} ds, \end{aligned}$$

which tends to zero by (3.17) as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $R_1 \rightarrow \infty$.

Let $\mathbb{Q}$ be the set of all rational numbers. By a diagonalization argument, there exists a common subsequence n_m and a null set N such that for all $\omega \notin N$ and $t \in \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, \tau_{R_2}(\omega)]$,

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} |X_t^{\ell^{n_m}}(\omega) - X_t^\ell(\omega)| = 0.$$

Thus, by Fatou's lemma and (3.18), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \exp \left\{ \frac{\sup_{s \in [0, t \wedge \tau_{R_2}]} H(X_s^\ell)}{8e^{\kappa_1 t}(\kappa_2 |\ell_t| + 1)} \right\} &= \mathbb{E} \exp \left\{ \frac{\sup_{s \in [0, t \wedge \tau_{R_2}] \cap \mathbb{Q}} H(X_s^\ell)}{8e^{\kappa_1 t}(\kappa_2 |\ell_t| + 1)} \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \exp \left\{ \sup_{s \in [0, t \wedge \tau_{R_2}] \cap \mathbb{Q}} \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{H(X_s^{\ell^{n_m}})}{8e^{\kappa_1 t}(\kappa_2 |\ell_t^{n_m}| + 1)} \right\} \\ &\leq \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \exp \left\{ \frac{\sup_{s \in [0, t \wedge \tau_{R_2}] \cap \mathbb{Q}} H(X_s^{\ell^{n_m}})}{8e^{\kappa_1 t}(\kappa_2 |\ell_t^{n_m}| + 1)} \right\} \\ &\leq C_{\kappa_2, \kappa_3} \exp \{H(x)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, letting $R_2 \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain (3.10).

(Step 4). As for (3.8), by Young's inequality we have

$$pH^{\frac{1}{2}}(X_s) \leq \frac{H(X_s)}{16e^{\kappa_1 t}(\kappa_2 |S_t| + 1)} + C_p(\kappa_2 |S_t| + 1).$$

By Hölder's inequality and (3.7), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ p \sup_{s \in [0, t]} H(X_s)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} \right] \leq C_{\kappa_2, \kappa_3} e^{H(x)} \left(\mathbb{E} e^{2C_p(\kappa_2 |S_t| + 1)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq C_{\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3, p, t} e^{H(x)},$$

where the second inequality is due to $(\mathbf{H}_{v_S}^2)$. □

4. MALLIAVIN COVARIANCE MATRIX

In the sequel, in addition to (3.3)-(3.5), we also assume that for any $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and some $q_m \geq 0$,

$$|\nabla^m b(x)| \leq C(H(x)^{q_m} + 1), \quad (4.1)$$

where

$$q_1 \in [0, \frac{1}{2}].$$

By Theorem 3.1, it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} w &\mapsto X_t(x, w, \ell) \in \mathbb{D}^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d), \\ x &\mapsto X_t(x, w, \ell) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d). \end{aligned}$$

Let $J_t = J_t(x) = \nabla X_t(x)$ be the derivative matrix of $X_t(x)$ with respect to x . Then J_t satisfies

$$J_t = I + \int_0^t \nabla b(X_s) \cdot J_s ds. \quad (4.2)$$

Let K_t be the inverse matrix of J_t . Then K_t satisfies

$$K_t = I - \int_0^t K_s \cdot \nabla b(X_s) ds. \quad (4.3)$$

We prepare the following basic estimates for later use.

Lemma 4.1. Assume $(\mathbf{H}_{v_S}^2)$. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, let $X_t(x)$ be the solution of SDE (3.1).

(i) For any $p \geq 1$, there exists a constant $C_p > 0$ such that for all $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{s \in [0, t]} |S_s|^p \right) \leq C_p t. \quad (4.4)$$

(ii) There exists a constant $C_x > 0$ such that for all $t \in [0, 1]$ and $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$P \left\{ \sup_{s \in [0, t]} |X_s(x) - x| > \varepsilon \right\} \leq \frac{C_x t}{\varepsilon^2}. \quad (4.5)$$

(iii) For any $p \geq 2$, there exists a constant $C_{p,x} > 0$ such that for all $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{s \in [0, t]} |J_s(x) - I|^p \right) + \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{s \in [0, t]} |K_s(x) - I|^p \right) \leq C_{p,x} t^p. \quad (4.6)$$

(iv) For any $p \geq 2$ and $m, k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $m + k \geq 1$, there exists a constant $C_{p,m,k,x} > 0$ such that for all $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{s \in [0, t]} \|D^m \nabla^k X_s(x)\|_{\mathbb{H}^{\otimes m}}^p \right) \leq C_{p,m,k,x} \begin{cases} 1, & m = 0, k = 1; \\ t, & m = 1, k = 0; \\ t^p, & m + k \geq 2. \end{cases} \quad (4.7)$$

Proof. (i) By (2.1) and $(\mathbf{H}_{\nu_S}^2)$, we can write

$$S_t = t \left(\vartheta + \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} u \nu_S(du) \right) + \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} u \tilde{\mu}(t, du) =: t \vartheta' + \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} u \tilde{\mu}(t, du).$$

By Itô's formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |S_t|^p &= p \int_0^t |S_s|^{p-2} \langle S_s, \vartheta' \rangle ds + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} (|S_{s-} + u|^p - |S_{s-}|^p) \tilde{\mu}(ds, du) \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} (|S_{s-} + u|^p - |S_{s-}|^p - p \langle u, S_{s-} \rangle |S_{s-}|^{p-2}) \nu_S(du) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Taking expectations and by Young's inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|S_t|^p &\leq p |\vartheta'| \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|S_s|^{p-1} ds + p \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} |u| (|S_{s-}| + |u|)^{p-1} + |S_{s-}|^{p-1} \nu_S(du) ds \\ &\leq C_p \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|S_s|^{p-1} ds + C_p t \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} |u|^p \nu_S(du) \leq C_p \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|S_s|^p ds + C_p t, \end{aligned}$$

which then gives the estimate (4.4) by Gronwall's inequality and that each component of S_t is increasing.

(ii) Noticing that

$$\sup_{t \in [0, t]} |X_s(x) - x| \leq \int_0^t |b(X_s(x))| ds + \sup_{s \in [0, t]} |W_{S_s}|,$$

by Chebyshev's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P \left\{ \sup_{s \in [0, t]} |X_s(x) - x| > \varepsilon \right\} &\leq \frac{2}{\varepsilon^2} \left(t \int_0^t \mathbb{E}|b(X_s(x))|^2 ds + \mathbb{E} \left(\sup_{s \in [0, t]} |W_{S_s}|^2 \right) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^2} \left(t \int_0^t (\mathbb{E}|H(X_s(x))|^{q_0} + 1) ds + \mathbb{E}|S_t| \right), \end{aligned}$$

which yields (4.5) by (3.8) and (4.4).

(iii) By (4.2), we have

$$|J_t - I| \leq \int_0^t |\nabla b(X_s)| \cdot |J_s - I| ds + \int_0^t |\nabla b(X_s)| ds.$$

which yields by Gronwall's inequality that

$$|J_t - I| \leq \left(\exp \left\{ \int_0^t |\nabla b(X_s)| ds \right\} + 1 \right) \int_0^t |\nabla b(X_s)| ds$$

By (4.1) with $q_1 \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ and (3.8), we obtain (4.6).

(iv) Notice that for $h \in \mathbb{H}$,

$$D_h X_t = \int_0^t \nabla b(X_s) D_h X_s ds + A h_{S_t}. \quad (4.8)$$

Let $\{h^n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be an orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{H}$. Then

$$\|DX_t\|_{\mathbb{H}} = \left(\sum_n |D_{h^n} X_t|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \int_0^t |\nabla b(X_s)| \cdot \|DX_s\|_{\mathbb{H}} ds + \left(\sum_n |A h_{S_t}^n|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

By Gronwall's inequality and (4.10) below, we obtain

$$\|DX_t\|_{\mathbb{H}} \leq \|A\| \cdot |S_t|^{1/2} + \exp \left\{ \int_0^t |\nabla b(X_s)| ds \right\} \int_0^t \|A\| \cdot |S_s|^{1/2} ds,$$

which, by (3.8), (4.1) with $q_1 \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$, Hölder's inequality and (i), then gives (4.7) for $m = 1$ and $k = 0$. For the general m and k , it follows by similar calculations and induction method. $\square$

Remark 4.2. From the above proof, it is easy to see that if $b \in C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then C_x in (4.5), $C_{p,x}$ in (4.6) and $C_{p,m,k,x}$ in (4.7) can be independent of $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

We need the following simple formula about the change of variables (cf. [14]).

Lemma 4.3. Let $f : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded measurable function, and $h : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ an absolutely continuous function with integrable derivative. Given a càdlàg increasing function ℓ , we have

$$\int_0^t f_s dh_{\ell_s} = \int_0^{\ell_t} f_{\ell_s^{-1}} \dot{h}_s ds, \quad (4.9)$$

where $\ell_t^{-1} := \inf\{s \geq 0 : \ell_s > t\}$.

Proof. By definition, it is easy to see that

$$\ell_t^{-1} > a \Rightarrow t \geq \ell_a,$$

and

$$\ell_t^{-1} \leq a \Rightarrow t \leq \ell_a.$$

Thus, for $0 \leq a < b \leq t$ we have

$$(\ell_a, \ell_b) \subset \{s : \ell_s^{-1} \in (a, b)\} \subset [\ell_a, \ell_b].$$

Hence,

$$\int_0^{\ell_t} 1_{(a,b]}(\ell_s^{-1}) \dot{h}_s ds = \int_0^{\ell_t} 1_{(\ell_a, \ell_b]}(s) \dot{h}_s ds = h_{\ell_b} - h_{\ell_a} = \int_0^t 1_{(a,b]}(s) dh_{\ell_s}.$$

In particular, (4.9) holds for step functions. For general bounded measurable f , it follows by a monotone class argument. $\square$

Lemma 4.4. Let $f, g : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ be two bounded measurable functions, and $\{h^n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ an orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{H}$. We have

$$\sum_n \left(\int_0^t f_s \cdot dh_{\ell_s}^n \right) \left(\int_0^t g_s \cdot dh_{\ell_s}^n \right) = \sum_k \int_0^t f_s^k g_s^k d\ell_s^k. \quad (4.10)$$

Proof. If we define

$$\hat{f}_s^k := 1_{[0, \ell_s^k]}(s) f_{(\ell_s^k)^{-1}}^k, \quad s \geq 0,$$

and let $\hat{f}_s = (\hat{f}_s^1, \dots, \hat{f}_s^d)$, then by formula (4.9), we have

$$\int_0^t f_s \cdot dh_{\ell_s}^n = \int_0^\infty \hat{f}_s \cdot h_s^n ds.$$

Thus, by Parsavel's equality, the left hand side of (4.10) equals to

$$\sum_n \left(\int_0^\infty \hat{f}_s \cdot h_s^n ds \right) \left(\int_0^\infty \hat{g}_s \cdot h_s^n ds \right) = \int_0^\infty \hat{f}_s \cdot \hat{g}_s ds = \sum_k \int_0^{\ell_t^k} f_{(\ell_s^k)^{-1}}^k g_{(\ell_s^k)^{-1}}^k ds,$$

which then gives (4.10) by (4.9) again. $\square$

The following lemma originally appeared in the proof of [14, Theorem 3.3].

Lemma 4.5. Let $(\Sigma_t(x))_{ij} := \langle DX_t^i(x), DX_t^j(x) \rangle_{\mathbb{H}}$ be the Malliavin covariance matrix of $X_t(x)$. We have

$$\Sigma_t(x) = J_t(x) \left(\sum_k \int_0^t K_s(x) a_{\cdot k} (K_s(x) a_{\cdot k})^* dS_s^k \right) (J_t(x))^*. \quad (4.11)$$

Proof. By (4.2), (4.8) and the variation of constant formula, we have

$$D_h X_t(x) = \int_0^t J_t K_s(x) Adh_{S_s}.$$

Let $\{h^n, n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be an orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{H}$. Then,

$$\Sigma_t(x) = \sum_n D_{h^n} X_t(x) \cdot (D_{h^n} X_t(x))^* = \sum_n \left(\int_0^t J_t(x) K_s(x) Adh_{S_s}^n \right) \cdot \left(\int_0^t J_t(x) K_s(x) Adh_{S_s}^n \right)^*,$$

which in turn gives the formula (4.11) by (4.10). $\square$

5. PROOF OF MAIN THEOREM

In this section we consider the following SDE

$$X_t = x + \int_0^t b(X_s) ds + AW_{S_t} \stackrel{(2.3)}{=} x + \int_0^t b(X_s) ds + AW_{\theta t} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} Ay \tilde{N}(t, dy), \quad (5.1)$$

where, in addition to $(\mathbf{H}_{v_s}^1)$ and $(\mathbf{H}_{v_s}^2)$, we assume that $b \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and

$(\mathbf{H}_b^1)$ For some some Lyapunov function H and $\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3 > 0$,

$$b(x) \cdot \nabla H(x) \leq \kappa_1 H(x), \quad \left| \sum_i \partial_i H(x) a_{ik} \right|^2 \leq \kappa_2 H(x), \quad \sum_{ij} \partial_i \partial_j H(x) a_{ik} a_{jk} \leq \kappa_3, \quad (5.2)$$

and for any $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$, there is a $q_m \geq 0$ such that

$$|\nabla^m b(x)| \leq C(H(x)^{q_m} + 1), \quad (5.3)$$

where $q_1 \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$.

(H_b²) For some $\kappa_4, \kappa_5, \kappa_6 > 0$,

$$|(\nabla b(x + Ay) - \nabla b(x))A| \leq \kappa_4(1 \wedge |y|), \quad (5.4)$$

$$|(\nabla b(x + Ay) - \nabla b(x) - Ay \cdot \nabla^2 b(x))A| \leq \kappa_5|y|^2, \quad (5.5)$$

$$\inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} \inf_{|u|=1} (|uA|^2 + |u \nabla b(x)A|^2) = \kappa_6 > 0. \quad (5.6)$$

The following estimate is the key part for proving the smooth density of $X_t(x)$.

Lemma 5.1. *Let θ be given by (1.8). For any $p \geq 1$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, there exists a constant $C = C(p, d, \theta, x) > 0$ such that for all $t \in (0, 1]$,*

$$\|(\det \Sigma_t(x))^{-1}\|_p \leq Ct^{-\frac{2Ad}{\theta}}.$$

Moreover, if for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $q_m = 0$ in (5.3), then the above constant C can be independent of x .

Proof. We divide the proof into four steps.

(Step 1). Set

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t &:= uK_t A, \quad \beta_t := uK_t \nabla b(X_t)A, \quad Q_t := uK_t \nabla^2 b(X_t)A, \\ \gamma_t &:= uK_t \left(\sum_i b^i \cdot \partial_i \nabla b A - (\nabla b)^2 A + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ijk} (\partial_i \partial_j \nabla b) a_{ik} a_{jk} \vartheta_k \right) (X_t) \\ &\quad + uK_t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\nabla b(X_t + Ay) - \nabla b(X_t) - Ay \cdot \nabla^2 b(X_t)) A \nu_L(dy), \\ g_t(y) &:= uK_t (\nabla b(X_{t-} + Ay) - \nabla b(X_{t-}))A. \end{aligned}$$

By equations (4.3), (5.1) and Itô's formula, one sees that

$$Y_t = aA + \int_0^t \beta_s ds,$$

and

$$\beta_t = a \nabla b(x)A + \int_0^t \gamma_s ds + \int_0^t Q_s ds + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} g_s(y) \tilde{N}(ds, dy).$$

By (5.3)-(5.7), it is easy to see that

$$|g_t(y)| \leq C|K_t|(1 \wedge |y|),$$

and for some $q > 0$,

$$|\beta_t| + |\gamma_t| + |Q_t| \leq C|K_t|(H(X_t)^q + 1).$$

(Step 2). For $R \geq 1$, define the stopping times

$$\tau_R := \inf \{t \geq 0 : |K_t| \geq R, H(X_t) \geq R\},$$

and

$$\tau_0 := \inf \{s \geq 0 : |K_s - I| \geq \frac{1}{2}\}.$$

For $\eta \in (0, 1)$, set

$$E_t^\varepsilon := \left\{ \int_0^t |uK_s A|^2 ds < \varepsilon^\eta \right\},$$

and for $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{3})$ and $R \geq 1$,

$$F_t^{\varepsilon, R} := \left\{ \int_0^t |uK_s \nabla b(X_s)A|^2 ds < 9R^2 \varepsilon^{\eta\delta} \right\}.$$

By Lemma 2.4, there is a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that for all $0 < \varepsilon < t^{3/\eta} \leq 1$ and $R \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} P(E_t^\varepsilon \cap \{t < \tau_R\}) &= P(E_t^\varepsilon \cap (F_t^{\varepsilon,R})^c \cap \{t < \tau_R\}) + P(E_t^\varepsilon \cap F_t^{\varepsilon,R} \cap \{t < \tau_R\}) \\ &\leq 4 \exp\left\{-\frac{\varepsilon^{\eta(\delta-\frac{1}{3})}}{CR^4}\right\} + P(E_t^\varepsilon \cap F_t^{\varepsilon,R} \cap \{\tau_0 \geq \varepsilon^{\delta\eta}\}) + P(\tau_0 < \varepsilon^{\delta\eta}). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by (5.6) we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_t^\varepsilon \cap F_t^{\varepsilon,R} &\subset \left\{ \int_0^t (|uK_s A|^2 + |uK_s \nabla b(X_s) A|^2) ds < \varepsilon^\eta + 9R^2 \varepsilon^{\delta\eta} \right\} \\ &\subset \left\{ \int_0^t \frac{|uK_s A|^2 + |uK_s \nabla b(X_s) A|^2}{|uK_s|^2} |uK_s|^2 ds < 10R^2 \varepsilon^{\delta\eta} \right\} \\ &\subset \left\{ \kappa_6 \int_0^t |uK_s|^2 ds < 10R^2 \varepsilon^{\delta\eta} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since for any $|u| = 1$ and $s \in [0, \tau_0]$,

$$|uK_s| \geq 1 - |K_s - I| \geq \frac{1}{2},$$

it is easy to see that for any $\varepsilon < (\frac{\kappa_6 t}{20R^2})^{\frac{1}{\delta\eta}}$,

$$E_t^\varepsilon \cap F_t^{\varepsilon,R} \cap \{\tau_0 \geq \varepsilon^{\delta\eta}\} = \emptyset.$$

Hence, for $\eta \in (0, 1)$, $\delta \in (0, \frac{1}{3})$, $R \geq 1$ and $\varepsilon < (\frac{\kappa_6 t}{20R^2})^{\frac{1}{\delta\eta}}$,

$$P(E_t^\varepsilon \cap \{t < \tau_R\}) \leq 4 \exp\left\{-\frac{\varepsilon^{\eta(\delta-\frac{1}{3})}}{CR^4}\right\} + P(\tau_0 < \varepsilon^{\delta\eta}). \quad (5.7)$$

(Step 3). Now, by Lemma 2.1 and (5.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} P\left\{ \int_0^t \sum_k |uK_s a_{\cdot k}|^2 dS_s^k \leq \varepsilon \right\} &\leq P\left\{ \int_0^t \sum_k |uK_s a_{\cdot k}|^2 dS_s^k \leq \varepsilon, \int_0^t |uK_s A|^2 ds \geq \varepsilon^\eta; t < \tau_R \right\} \\ &\quad + P\left\{ \int_0^t |uK_s A|^2 ds < \varepsilon^\eta; t < \tau_R \right\} + P(\tau_R \leq t) \\ &\leq \exp\left\{1 - \frac{\phi(\varepsilon/R)\varepsilon^\eta}{\varepsilon}\right\} + 4 \exp\left\{-\frac{\varepsilon^{\eta(\delta-\frac{1}{3})}}{CR^4}\right\} \\ &\quad + P(\tau_0 < \varepsilon^{\delta\eta}) + P(\tau_R \leq t), \end{aligned} \quad (5.8)$$

where

$$\eta \in (0, 1), \quad \delta \in (0, \frac{1}{3}), \quad R \geq 1, \quad \varepsilon < \left(\frac{\kappa_6 t}{20R^2}\right)^{\frac{1}{\delta\eta}}.$$

For any $p > 1$, by Chebyshev's inequality and (4.6), we have

$$P(\tau_0 < \varepsilon^{\delta\eta}) = P\left\{ \sup_{s \in (0, \varepsilon^{\delta\eta})} |K_s - I| \geq \frac{1}{2} \right\} \leq 2^p \mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{s \in (0, \varepsilon^{\delta\eta})} |K_s - I|^p \right) \leq C \varepsilon^{p\delta\eta}, \quad (5.9)$$

and by (3.8) and (4.6),

$$P(\tau_R \leq t) \leq \frac{1}{R^p} \mathbb{E}\left(\sup_{s \in [0, t]} (|K_s| + H(X_s))^p \right) \leq \frac{C}{R^p}. \quad (5.10)$$

Let θ be given by (1.8). If we choose

$$\eta = \frac{\theta}{2}, \quad \delta = \frac{1}{6}, \quad R = \varepsilon^{-\frac{\theta}{48}},$$

then by (5.8), (5.9) and (5.10), we get for any $t \in (0, 1)$, $p \geq 1$ and $\varepsilon \in \left(0, \left(\frac{\kappa_6 t}{20}\right)^{\frac{24}{\theta}}\right)$,

$$P \left\{ \int_0^t \sum_k |u K_s a_k|^2 dS_s^k \leq \varepsilon \right\} \leq C \varepsilon^p. \quad (5.11)$$

(Step 4). Let

$$\xi_t := \inf_{|u|=1} \sum_k \int_0^t |u K_s a_k|^2 dS_s^k.$$

Since S_t has finite moments of all orders, by (4.7) and a compact argument (see [20, p. 133, Lemma 2.3.1] for more details), for any $p \geq 1$, there exists a constant $C_0 = C_0(p, d, \kappa_6) > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, C_0 t^{\frac{24}{\theta}})$,

$$P\{\xi_t \leq \varepsilon\} \leq C_p \varepsilon^p.$$

Hence, for all $t \in (0, 1]$,

$$\mathbb{E}(\xi_t^{-p}) = p \int_0^\infty \lambda^{p-1} P(\xi_t^{-1} \geq \lambda) d\lambda \leq p \int_0^{C_0^{-1} t^{-\frac{24}{\theta}}} \lambda^{p-1} d\lambda + C_p \int_{C_0^{-1} t^{-\frac{24}{\theta}}}^\infty \lambda^{-2} d\lambda \leq C_p t^{-\frac{24p}{\theta}}.$$

The desired estimate now follows by (4.6) and noticing that the smallest eigenvalue of a real symmetric matrix M is less than $(\det M)^{\frac{1}{d}}$. $\square$

We are now in a position to prove the following main result of this paper.

Theorem 5.2. *Under $(\mathbf{H}_{v_s}^1)$, $(\mathbf{H}_{v_s}^2)$, $(\mathbf{H}_b^1)$ and $(\mathbf{H}_b^2)$, the solution $X_t(x)$ of SDE (5.1) admits a smooth density $\rho(t, x, y)$ as a function on $(0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Moreover, we have the following conclusions:*

- (i) *For each $t > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\rho(t, x, \cdot) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and solves the following Fokker-Planck equation:*

$$\partial_t \rho = \mathcal{L} \rho(t, x, \cdot) + \operatorname{div}(b \rho(t, x, \cdot)), \quad (5.12)$$

where

$$\mathcal{L} f(y) = \text{P.V.} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (f(y + Az) - f(y)) \nu_L(dz) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ijk} (\partial_i \partial_j f)(y) a_{ik} a_{jk} \vartheta_k.$$

- (ii) *There exist constants $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3 > 0$ only depending on d and θ such that for all $(t, x, y) \in (0, 1] \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$\rho(t, x, y) \leq C_x \left(t^{-\beta_1} \left(1 \wedge \frac{t^{\beta_2}}{|x - y|^{\beta_3}} \right) \right), \quad (5.13)$$

where C_x continuously depends on x .

- (iii) *Suppose that $b \in C_b^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then C_x in (5.13) can be independent of x .*

Proof. For $k, m \in \mathbb{N}$, by the chain rule, we have

$$\nabla^k \mathbb{E}(\nabla^m f)(X_t(x)) = \sum_{j=1}^k \mathbb{E}((\nabla^{m+j} f)(X_t(x)) G_j(\nabla X_t(x), \dots, \nabla^k X_t(x))),$$

where $\{G_j, j = 1, \dots, k\}$ are real polynomial functions. By Theorem 2.5 and Lemmas 4.1, 5.1, one finds that there exist $\gamma_{k,m} > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that for all $t \in (0, 1)$,

$$|\nabla^k \mathbb{E}(\nabla^m f)(X_t(x))| \leq C \|f\|_\infty t^{-\gamma_{k,m}}. \quad (5.14)$$

Now, by Sobolev's embedding theorem (see [20, pp.102-103]), for each $(t, x) \in (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d$, there exists a smooth density $\rho(t, x, \cdot) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Moreover,

$$(x, y) \mapsto \rho(t, x, y) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d).$$

By Itô's formula, one sees that ρ satisfies equation (5.12). The smoothness of $\rho(t, x, y)$ with respect to the time variable t follows by equation (5.12) and the standard bootstrap argument.

Now we use a trick of Kusuoka and Stroock [16] to prove (5.13). Let $\chi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, 1]$ be a smooth cutoff function with $\chi(y) = 0$ for $|y| < \frac{1}{2}$ and $\chi(y) = 1$ for $|y| > \frac{3}{4}$. For $\varepsilon > 0$, define

$$\chi_\varepsilon(y) := \chi(y/\varepsilon), \quad \chi_0(y) = 1.$$

By (2.11), we have for any $q > d$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\chi_\varepsilon(\cdot - x)\rho(t, x, \cdot)\|_\infty &\leq C \|\chi_\varepsilon(X_t(x) - x)\|_q^{1-\frac{d}{q}} \left(\sum_i \|H_{(i)}(X_t(x), 1)\|_q \right)^{(1-\frac{1}{q})d} \\ &\quad \times \left(\sum_i \|H_{(i)}(X_t(x), \chi_\varepsilon(X_t(x) - x))\|_q \right)^{\frac{d}{q}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

By (2.9), (2.8) and Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|H_{(i)}(X_t(x), \chi_\varepsilon(X_t(x) - x))\|_q &\leq \| |\nabla \chi_\varepsilon(X_t(x) - x)| \cdot \|\Sigma_t^{-1}\| \cdot \|DX_t\|_{\mathbb{H}}^2 \|_q \\ &\quad + \|\chi_\varepsilon(X_t(x) - x) \cdot \|D\Sigma_t^{-1}\| \cdot \|DX_t\|_{\mathbb{H}} \|_q \\ &\quad + \|\chi_\varepsilon(X_t(x) - x) \cdot \|\Sigma_t^{-1}\| \cdot \|D^*DX_t\| \|_q \\ &\leq \| |\nabla \chi_\varepsilon(X_t(x) - x)| \|_{q_1} \|\Sigma_t^{-1}\|_{q_2} \|DX_t\|_{2q_3}^2 \\ &\quad + \|\chi_\varepsilon(X_t(x) - x)\|_{q_1} \|D\Sigma_t^{-1}\|_{q_2} \|DX_t\|_{q_3} \\ &\quad + \|\chi_\varepsilon(X_t(x) - x)\|_{q_1} \|\Sigma_t^{-1}\|_{q_2} \|DX_t\|_{1,q_3}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2} + \frac{1}{q_3}$. Let $\text{adj}(\Sigma_t)$ be the adjugate matrix of Σ_t . Observing that

$$\Sigma_t^{-1} = \det(\Sigma_t)^{-1} \text{adj}(\Sigma_t), \quad D\Sigma_t^{-1} = \Sigma_t^{-1} D\Sigma_t \Sigma_t^{-1},$$

by the definition of $\text{adj}(\Sigma_t)$, we have

$$\|\Sigma_t^{-1}\|_{q_2} \leq \|\det(\Sigma_t)^{-1}\|_{2q_2} \|\text{adj}(\Sigma_t)\|_{2q_2} \leq C \|\det(\Sigma_t)^{-1}\|_{2q_2} \|DX_t\|_{4(d-1)q_2}^{2(d-1)},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|D\Sigma_t^{-1}\|_{q_2} &\leq \|\det(\Sigma_t)^{-1}\|_{8q_2}^2 \|\text{adj}(\Sigma_t)\|_{8q_2}^2 \|DX_t\|_{1,4q_2}^2 \\ &\leq C \|\det(\Sigma_t)^{-1}\|_{8q_2}^2 \|DX_t\|_{16(d-1)q_2}^{4(d-1)} \|DX_t\|_{1,4q_2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by (4.5), we have

$$\|\chi_\varepsilon(X_t(x) - x)\|_{q_1} \leq P \left\{ |X_t(x) - x| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right\}^{1/q_1} \leq C \frac{t^{1/q_1}}{\varepsilon^{2/q_1}},$$

and also

$$\|\nabla \chi_\varepsilon(X_t(x) - x)\|_{q_1} \leq \frac{\|\nabla \chi\|_\infty}{\varepsilon} P \left\{ |X_t(x) - x| \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \right\}^{1/q_1} \leq C \frac{t^{1/q_1}}{\varepsilon^{1+2/q_1}}.$$

Combining the above calculations and by Lemma 5.1 and (4.7), we obtain

$$\|H_{(i)}(X_t(x), \chi_\varepsilon(X_t(x) - x))\|_q \leq C \frac{t^{1/q_1}}{\varepsilon^{1+2/q_1}} \cdot t^{-\frac{24d}{\theta}} \cdot t^{\frac{1}{2q_2} + \frac{1}{q_3}} + C \frac{t^{1/q_1}}{\varepsilon^{2/q_1}} \left(t^{-\frac{48d}{\theta}} \cdot t^{\frac{3}{4q_2} + \frac{1}{q_3}} + t^{-\frac{24d}{\theta}} \cdot t^{\frac{1}{2q_2} + \frac{1}{q_3}} \right).$$

Similarly, we also have

$$\|H_{(i)}(X_t(x), 1)\|_q \leq C \left(t^{-\frac{48d}{\theta}} \cdot t^{\frac{3}{4q_2} + \frac{1}{q_3}} + t^{-\frac{24d}{\theta}} \cdot t^{\frac{1}{2q_2} + \frac{1}{q_3}} \right).$$

In (5.15), taking $\varepsilon = 0$ and $\varepsilon = |x - y|$ separately, by careful choices of parameters, we obtain (ii). As for (iii), it follows by Remark 4.2. $\square$

Now we can see that Theorem 1.3 is an easy application of Theorem 5.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.3: In the situation of Theorem 1.3, we set

$$A := \begin{pmatrix} 0, 0 \\ 0, I \end{pmatrix}, \quad b = \begin{pmatrix} b_1 \\ b_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

By (1.11) and (1.12), it is easy to see that (5.2) and (5.3) hold. By (1.13) and (1.14), one can see that (5.4), (5.5) and (5.6) hold.

Acknowledgements:

The author is very grateful to Professors Hua Chen, Zhen-Qing Chen and Feng-Yu Wang for their quite useful conversations. This work is supported by NSFs of China (No. 11271294) and Program for New Century Excellent Talents in University (NCET-10-0654).

REFERENCES

- [1] Arnold L.: Random dynamical systems, in: Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.
- [2] Applebaum D.: Lévy processes and stochastic calculus. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Math. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2004.
- [3] Bally V. and Clément E.: Integration by parts formula and applications to equations with jumps. Prob. Theory and Relat. Fields, 151, no.3-4, (2011), 613-657.
- [4] Bertoin J.: Lévy processes. Cambridge Tracts in Math. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996.
- [5] Bichtler K., Jacod J. and Gravereaux J.B.: Malliavin calculus for processes with jumps. Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, 1987.
- [6] Bismut J.M.: Calcul des variations stochastiques et processus de sauts. Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete, 63, 147-235(1983).
- [7] Cass T.: Smooth densities for stochastic differential equations with jumps. Stoch. Proc. Appl., 119, no.5, 1416-1435(2009).
- [8] Desvillettes L. and Villani C.: On the trend to global equilibrium in spatially inhomogeneous entropy-dissipating systems: the linear Fokker-Planck equation. Comm. Pure Appl. Math., Vol.54, no. 1, 1-42(2001).
- [9] Guillin A. and Wang F.Y.: Degenerate Fokker-Planck equations: Bismut formula, gradient estimate and Harnack inequality. J. Diff. Equa., Volume 253, Issue 1, Pages 20-40(2012).
- [10] Hérau F. and Nier F.: Isotropic hypoellipticity and trend to equilibrium for the Fokker-Planck equation with a high-degree potential. Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal., 171, No.2, 151-218(2001).
- [11] Hörmander L.: The Analysis of Linear Partial Differential Operators III: Pseudo-Differential Operators. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1985.
- [12] Ishikawa Y. and Kunita H.: Malliavin calculus on the Wiener-Poisson space and its application to canonical SDE with jumps. Stoch. Proc. Appl., 116, 1743-1769(2006).
- [13] Kulik A.: Conditions for existence and smoothness of the distribution density for Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes with Lévy noises. Theory Probab. Math. Statist. no.79, 23-38(2009).
- [14] Kusuoka S.: Malliavin calculus for stochastic differential equations driven by subordinated Brownian motions. Kyoto J. of Math. Vol.50, no.3, 491-520(2009).

- [15] Kusuoka S. and Stroock D.: Applications of the Malliavin Calculus, Part I. Stochastic Analysis, Proceedings of the Taniguchi International Symposium on Stochastic Analysis North-Holland Mathematical Library Volume 32, Pages 271-306(1984).
- [16] Kusuoka S. and Stroock D.: Applications of the Malliavin Calculus, Part II. J. Fac. of Sci., the Univ. of Tokyo, Vol. 32, No.1, 1-76(1985).
- [17] Léandre R.: Calcul des variations sur un brownien subordonné, in Séminaire de Prob., XXII, Lecture Notes Math. 1321, Springer, Berlin, 414-433(1988).
- [18] Malliavin P.: Stochastic analysis, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997.
- [19] Norris J.: Simplified Malliavin calculus. In: Séminaire de Probabilités XX, Lecture Notes in Math. 1204, , Springer, Berlin, 101130(1986).
- [20] Nualart D.: The Malliavin calculus and related topics. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2006.
- [21] Picard J.: On the existence of smooth densities for jump processes. Prob. Theory Relat. Fields, Vol. 105, 481–511(1996).
- [22] Priola E. and Zabczyk J.: Densities for Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes with jumps. Bull. London Math. Soc., Vol 41, 41-50(2009).
- [23] Protter P.E.: Stochastic integration and differential equations. Second Edition, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004.
- [24] Sato K.: Lévy processes and infinite divisible distributions. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1999.
- [25] Soize C.: The Fokker-Planck equation for stochastic dynamical systems and its explicit steady state solutions, Series on Advances in Mathematics for Applied Sciences 17, World Scientific, Singapore, 1994.
- [26] Takeuchi A.: The Malliavin calculus for SDE with jumps and the partially hypoelliptic problem. Osaka J. Math. 39, 523-559(2002).
- [27] Villani C.: Hypocoercivity. Memoir of AMS, 2008.
- [28] Wang F.Y. and Wang J.: Harnack inequalities for stochastic equations driven by Lévy noise. arXiv:1212.0405v1.
- [29] Wang F.Y. and Zhang X.: Derivative formula and applications for degenerate diffusion semigroups. J. Math. Pures et Appl., <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.matpur.2012.10.007>.
- [30] Zhang X.: Stochastic flows and Bismut formulas for stochastic Hamiltonian systems. Stoch. Proc. Appl. 120, 1929–1949(2010).
- [31] Zhang X.: Derivative formula and gradient estimate for SDEs driven by α -stable processes. Stoch. Proc. Appl., <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.spa.2012.11.012>.
- [32] Zhang X.: Densities for SDEs driven by degenerate α -stable processes. arXiv:1207.3565.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, WUHAN UNIVERSITY, WUHAN, HUBEI 430072, P.R.CHINA, EMAIL: XI-CHENGZHANG@GMAIL.COM